DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 422 295 SP 038 085

AUTHOR	Pryor, Sherrill Evenson; Mader, Cynthia E.
TITLE	Gender Equity Instruction in Teacher Education: What Do Students Learn? What Do Faculty Teach? What Are the Influences?
PUB DATE	1998-04-16
NOTE	43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 13-17, 1998).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; Higher Education; Preservice Teacher Education; Preservice Teachers; *Sex Fairness; *Student Attitudes; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; Teacher Influence

ABSTRACT

This study examined preservice teachers' perceptions of gender-related knowledge sources, faculty attitudes, and preferred curricular approaches in gender-equity instruction. The study also examined faculty perceptions of facilitators and barriers to gender-equity instruction. Participants were 758 preservice teachers at three universities and 247 teacher education faculty members in 29 preservice teacher education programs. Both groups responded to open-ended questions on the subject. Students identified sources of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices, and faculty identified their preferred curricular approach to gender-related instruction and ranked 10 factors facilitating instruction. Student responses revealed the power of classroom instruction to positively and negatively influence their knowledge. Many students relied on self-education, nonacademic sources, and real life experiences to learn about gender-equitable practices. Teacher education classes were the most common source of students' knowledge of gender-equity classroom practices, and women's studies courses were the least common source. There was strong faculty support for inclusion of gender gender-equity instruction and clear preferences for factors likely to increase such instruction. Almost 78 percent of the faculty said that gender-related instruction should be integrated throughout the curriculum. The most frequently chosen facilitator of gender-equity instruction was student interest, and the least frequently chosen facilitators were state licensing and national accreditation requirements. (Contains 80 references.) (Author/SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 422 295

GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:

WHAT DO STUDENTS LEARN? WHAT DO FACULTY TEACH? WHAT ARE THE influences?

Sherrill Evenson Pryor, Ed.D.
Cynthia E. Mader, Ph.D.

Grand Valley State University
School of Education
Allendale, Michigan 49401
(616) 771-6646

Internet: pryors@gvsu.edu
Internet: maderc@gvsu.edu

American Educational Research Association (AERA)
Annual Meeting
San Diego, California
April 16, 1998

SP030085

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Pryor

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

Abstract

Findings in this paper are part of larger efforts by two researchers. This paper examines education students' perceptions of gender-related knowledge sources, faculty attitudes and preferred curricular approaches in gender-equity instruction, and faculty perceptions of facilitators and barriers to gender-equity instruction.

The subjects of the research were from one midwestern state. In one study there were 758 preservice students at three separate universities and in the other study there were 247 full-time teacher education faculty members in the professional programs of 29 preservice teacher education programs. Open-ended comments were requested from both students and faculty. Students identified sources of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices while faculty identified their preferred curricular approach to gender-related instruction and ranked ten factors facilitating instruction.

Findings indicate that teacher education classes were the most frequently mentioned source of students' knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices (38%) and women's studies courses were the least frequently mentioned source of students' knowledge (5.5%). In the faculty study, almost 78% of the faculty said gender-related instruction should be integrated throughout the curriculum. The most frequently chosen facilitator of gender-equity instruction mentioned by faculty was student interest. The least frequently chosen facilitators were state licensing and national accreditation requirements.

Roundtable presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, San Diego, CA, April 16, 1998 by Sherrill Evenson Pryor, EdD. and Cynthia E. Mader, PhD. Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI.

GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:

WHAT DO STUDENTS LEARN? WHAT DO FACULTY TEACH? WHAT ARE THE INFLUENCES?

Objectives

Although almost a quarter-century of research has confirmed the presence of gender bias affecting female students in K-12 education (AAUW, 1992; Campbell, Voelkl, & Donahue, 1997; Sadker & Sadker, 1994), studies conducted during the 1970's and 1980's suggested the absence of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs. This absence existed despite the self-evident logic of teacher education as a starting place for such instruction and despite the documented effectiveness of such instruction in reducing gender bias in future teachers.

More recently, gender concerns have become part of the national discourse, and diversity education has become standard in many K-12 and teacher education programs. Nevertheless, studies of teacher education curricula conducted during the 1970's and extending into the 1990's confirmed that gender-related instruction remained limited or non-existent.

The findings detailed in these pages are part of larger efforts by the two researchers to also ascertain the actual extent of faculty instruction and student knowledge on issues of gender. These background findings will be summarized here, but the primary focus of this effort will be to examine the reasons for this lack of attention and identify factors which will increase faculty instruction and student knowledge. The following questions guided this effort:

1. What did students perceive to be the sources of their gender-related knowledge?

2. What were faculty attitudes and preferred curricular approaches toward gender equity instruction in their classes?

3. What did faculty perceive to be facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction?

Literature/Theoretical Framework

Concern with and interest in gender has been so ubiquitous in the 1990's that it is tempting to regard the topic as new and revolutionary. Fueled by controversial court cases involving elected officials and even a Supreme Court nominee, and popularized by

television commentators and newspaper reporters, issues involving gender have stimulated national discourse, discussion and debate (Center Research, 1992).

In 1972, legislative reform beginning with Title IX had drawn attention to improving K-12 educational practices (Stromquist, 1989). Numerous works by feminist scholars contributed philosophical and psychological foundations for analyses of gender in education (Gilligan, 1982; Lerner, 1981; Maher & Tetreault, 1994; McIntosh, 1984, Tetreault, 1985). Excellent reviews of the literature exist in several sources: AAUW, 1992; Biklen & Pollard, 1993; Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; Grant & Secada, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Sadker, Sadker & Klein, 1991; Sanders, 1997.

Providing the framework for the student study described here was the area of gender-equitable classroom practices. This area consisted of three categories (teacher expectations, teacher interactions, and classroom management/organization), factors found to influence high achievement (Davis & Thomas, 1989; Edmonds, 1979; Good & Brophy, 1987).

Teacher expectations are discussed in the AAUW report (1992) as one of many factors leading to 69% of elementary males and 60% of elementary females expressing happiness with themselves, compared to a subsequent decline when 46% of high school males and only 29% of high school females express happiness with themselves. Teacher expectations have been found to allow for little variation in student differences. Boys represent 71% of the identified learning-disabled students, a majority of early grade retentions, and 80% of those students labeled emotionally disturbed (Sadker & Sadker, 1989; 1994). In a 1991 study 74% of Michigan students expressed belief that boys and girls were treated differently. These same students thought that males' lives were easier and more fun and that females were often demeaned (Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education, 1992). Similar findings appear in a Wisconsin study of 3,363 students (Riley, Baldus, Nelson, Schuler, & Keyes, 1993).

In the area of teacher interactions, researchers have consistently found that male students demand and receive more teacher attention, both positive and negative (Eccles, 1989; Fennema & Peterson, 1986; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Putnam & Self, 1988; Sadker & Sadker, 1982, 1986, 1994). Interactions in forty math classrooms coded over a period of ten days revealed an imbalance of interactions. Over half of the students had no interactions with the teacher while the rest of the class, the majority of whom were male, had fourteen or more interactions (Eccles, 1989). Jungwirth (1991) concluded that teachers glossed over mathematics errors with males and magnified them with females. High-achieving females received the largest number of discouraging statements and least amount of praise (Purcell & Stewart, 1990). According to Streitmatter (1994) gender differentiated attitudes may be reinforced due to the bias of the English language. Disparity of interactions can be seen across subject areas (Baker, 1986; Banks & Banks, 1992; Fennema & Peterson, 1986; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Pflaum et al., 1980). Statements about the quality and content of work effort are used more frequently with

males, whereas females receive low ability statements about effort and about the form of their work (Grayson, 1987).

The physical and emotional classroom environment affects gender equity efforts. Authors and publishers still use male pronouns to describe individuals whose gender is unknown, history books contain few role models for females, and literature portrays females as helpless and males as adventuresome (AAUW, 1992; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1986, 1994; Smith, Greenlaw, & Scott, 1987; Tetreault, 1985). Martin and Lock (1991) found that preservice physical education teachers displayed little knowledge of gender-equitable teaching strategies and had little information regarding Title IX rights. Teachers tend to choose methods, materials and curriculum favoring the needs of males (AAUW, 1992; Baenninger & Newcombe, 1989; Shakeshaft, 1986). A study of a third grade classroom learning about the Middle Ages revealed that students were told about three males each minute and one female every six minutes. When interviewed, students could not remember the females from the lesson (Alton-Lee, Densem, & Nuthall, 1991).

Report card grades are lower for males than for females, yet males performed better on math placement tests (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Few females are in remedial programs, and when they are referred they are older and farther behind (Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education, 1989). Females are more likely to be placed in lower math groups than appropriate for their test scores (National Science Foundation, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Sexual harassment by either gender meets with little interference from teachers or administrators (Stein, 1992, 1993; Thorne, 1993). The message of language, curricular materials, classroom grouping and classroom management is a stereotypical message for both genders (AAUW, 1992; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Pryor (1996, 1997) conducted background research with 758 preservice students in conjunction with the efforts described later in this report and with the same sample of preservice students. Data revealed a low level of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices. Preservice students correctly answered fewer than 50% of the items on the 37-item assessment instrument. Frequency distribution revealed that only 7.3% of the sample preservice students correctly answered 75% or more of the items on the assessment, and 10% of these same preservice students correctly answered nine or fewer items.

Teacher education programs offered a natural starting point for addressing gender issues in education. Evidence from experimental studies bolstered the belief that preservice students could learn valuable strategies if exposed to them. Although limited in number, these findings demonstrated that students who were exposed to gender-equitable strategies gained in knowledge and attitudes; incorporated more scholarship on women in their curricula; engaged in a greater number of equitable teaching behaviors; and reported experiencing critical insights into gender-related issues (Grant & Secada, 1990; Henington, 1981; Nelson, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1981; Sleeter, 1993).

Teacher educators, however, were slow to integrate gender issues into the curriculum. Early research revealed that teacher education programs rarely mandated or integrated gender instruction in their programs. Few programs addressed it all. Of those that did, few offered separate courses related to gender in education; these courses were elective, integration of gender issues into the preservice curriculum was limited; students and faculty colleagues were indifferent or hostile; and few programs assessed competence in gender-fair teaching strategies (Lather, 1983; McCune & Matthews, 1975b; Sadker, 1981; Styer, 1982; Woolever, 1981). Howe's (1979) pronouncement that schools of education were "among the most resistant to the impact of the women's movement" remained accurate into the 1990's.

More recently, Wilson (1993) surveyed administrators of 547 teacher education programs with NCATE accreditation. Of the 200 respondents, 54% reported no gender component in their preservice program. Wilson's preliminary data indicated that accreditation was not necessarily associated with the inclusion of instruction on gender issues; multicultural courses were more prevalent than separate courses; elective courses predominated; programmatic guidelines for gender equity instruction were not prevalent; and assessment was rare.

Mader (1994) conducted background research in conjunction with the efforts described later in this report and with the same faculty population. Teacher education faculty were found to be staunch advocates of instruction on gender issues. Some 98% advocated inclusion of gender-related instruction, but only 8% provided in-depth instruction in their own classes. Also found were limited evidence of program-wide instruction on gender, little ongoing faculty discussion of the topic, limited administrative support, and few policy statements or program guidelines (Mader & King, 1995; Mader & Sanders, 1994).

Numerous suggestions have been given for the dearth of gender-related instruction in teacher education. Most frequent are lack of professional literature; absence of suitable textbooks; weak certification and accreditation standards; overcrowded curriculum; student resistance; faculty and administrative indifference; male-defined educational theory; over-representation of males in school leadership and teacher education faculty; over-representation of "good girls" in the teaching rank and file; and the tendency of traditional teacher education to be reproductive rather than reconstructive in nature (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; Grant & Secada, 1990; Lather, 1983; Masland, 1992; McCune & Matthews, 1975a; Rose & Dunne, 1989; Sadker & Sadker, 1980; Titus, 1993).

Methodology/Data Collection

Two instruments were devised--one for preservice students, one for preservice faculty. The research was conducted in one midwestern state which provides a large cadre of new teachers each year; two of the state's programs ranked sixth and seventh in the nation in enrollment (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, cited in Stewart, 1992).

The preservice student subjects were 758 preservice teachers at three large universities in the state. Students in the sample were attending their required student teaching orientation session. Demographic data collected on the sample of 758 subjects revealed that 214 identified themselves as males, 529 as females, and 15 gave no identifying response. A chi-square goodness of fit analysis with the population of practicing teachers (Statistical Abstract, 1995, p.77) revealed no differences between the sample and the teacher population on the variables of gender ($X^2(1)=1.09$, $p=.05$) or ethnicity ($X^2(4)=8.29$, $p=.05$). Data were gathered on site by the researcher or an associate. The part of the instrument discussed in this report requested that the respondents identify and describe their sources of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices from a list of seven options.

The Faculty Survey Instrument was sent to the 247 full-time teacher education faculty members teaching in the professional programs of 29 preservice teacher education institutions in the state. This number included all the approved programs in the state except two, one of which served as the faculty pilot study institution, the other of which was undergoing substantial curricular change at the time of the study. The institutions were both publicly and privately funded; some were accredited by national organizations, some were not; they ranged in size from 15 to 700 teacher education graduates per year. Faculty from 28 of the 29 institutions responded, with an overall response rate of 53% and a median institutional response rate of 65%. The parts of the instrument under discussion in this report contained a preliminary section eliciting demographic information and three sections on preferred curricular approaches and perceived facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction.

The faculty demographic profile showed an established, traditional faculty representing a wide range of institutions. More than 44% of the respondents were over the age of fifty. Caucasians comprised 90% of the respondents. Almost 42% were tenured, 28% tenure track, and 30% "other." Approximately 23% were full professors, 26% associate, 31% assistant, 20% "other." A variety of teaching areas was represented: foundations, methods, clinical, and psychology and human development. More females (56%) than males (44%) responded although the instrument was sent to males and females in nearly equal proportion. Public and private institutions were well represented, as were large and small programs, accredited and not.

Results

The results of these studies give insight into preservice students' sources of knowledge, faculty attitudes, preferred curricular approaches, and perceived facilitators of gender equity instruction. Student responses revealed the power of classroom instruction to influence their knowledge both positively and negatively. Data also revealed strong faculty support for inclusion of gender equity instruction and clear preferences for factors likely to increase such instruction. Before presenting the variety of open-ended student and faculty responses, quantitative data might better reveal the overall pattern of responses.

Student data revealed that more preservice teachers (38%) identified teacher education classes as the source of their knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices than any other factor. Some 24% identified classes in their major/minor, 23% classes in multicultural education. Over 20% identified self-education and 15% nonacademic sources as the ways in which they learned about gender-equitable classroom practices. Another 15% identified a specific course or professor, and only 5.5% identified women's studies courses (Table 1).

Faculty were asked to identify their preferred curricular approach for gender-related instruction from among four choices: a) separate courses, b) integrated courses, c) dual approach--separate and integrated, d) no coverage of gender-related instruction. Almost 78% said it should be integrated throughout the curriculum. Only one respondent said it had no place in the curriculum of future teachers (Table 2).

Faculty were also asked to rank ten factors on whether they would increase the amount of gender equity instruction. These potential facilitators were drawn from the literature noted earlier. Student interest was the facilitator chosen most frequently by faculty. Other facilitators which appeared at least somewhat potent were professional literature, texts and materials, general news and media coverage, and administrative support. Factors considered least facilitative were certification tests, accreditation requirements, in-service seminars, and formal program policies (Table 3).

Open-ended comments from both students and faculty represented a wide variety of opinions--most encouraging, some contradictory, and a few frustrating in their seemingly unexamined assumptions.

Students most frequently identified their teacher education classes as having the most influence on their knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices. They cited courses in social foundations, curriculum, teaching methods, and psychology. Comments on their multicultural education courses indicated that, in one university at least, multicultural education studies were equated with African American literature and African American studies. At the other two universities where multicultural courses were mentioned, gender equity was often a part of the course. When identifying courses in their major/minor as the source of knowledge about gender, courses varied from university to university, but respondents at all three listed math, science, special education and physical education courses. Women's studies was identified by only a small number of respondents, but self-education and nonacademic sources were identified by many. Respondents frequently listed news media, family and books as influencing their knowledge about gender-equitable classroom practices (Appendix A).

Faculty were asked three open-ended questions to elicit further comment on facilitators and obstacles to gender equity instruction and for additional thoughts on the topic not covered in other ways in the instrument. In its printed format, the entire verbatim transcript of open-ended faculty responses comprised almost 20 pages. In naming

facilitators, faculty noted that they would be greatly assisted by good research and materials, good texts, good journal articles, and other supportive information upon which to base student assignments. In terms of barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction, there was considerable consensus that time constraints and an overcrowded curriculum had a negative effect. Many individuals mentioned this either directly or indirectly. Another constraint was noted to be student disinterest or outright resistance to the topic. Some respondents even noted their own ignorance and biases as significant barriers (Appendix C).

Conclusions/Educational Importance

The results of these studies corroborate earlier research showing that teacher education programs continue to lag behind in the study of gender issues--this despite almost a quarter century of public and scholarly attention and despite professed enthusiasm for such instruction by faculty.

Students are not consistently learning about the importance of this area of study in their teacher education classes, multicultural classes, and major/minor classes. Some preservice students observed gender-equitable classroom practices during their pre-student teaching experience while others observed inequitable practices. Reason for optimism is noted in some comments that stated all courses had an impact on their knowledge and that specific teaching strategies were discussed. In addition, major/minor classes in traditionally male-dominated areas and special education are addressing issues of gender equity.

Providing less cause for optimism are student comments that gender-equitable classroom practices receive very little coverage, are "touched on" or are dependent on the course instructor. Major/minor areas that are traditionally female-dominated were absent from the comments. Finally, multicultural studies were frequently equated with African American studies, yet equity should include all cultural groups.

Many students rely on self education, nonacademic sources, and "real life" experiences, e.g., television specials, to learn about gender-equitable practices. Many students believe that no special training is needed, as evidenced in one open-ended comment that life can teach "any bonehead" about equity. It should also be noted that students have volunteer and family experiences that have taught them about gender and which should be applauded and encouraged by teacher education programs.

Faculty responses about facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction were generally consistent with the literature although some differences were apparent. Respondents agreed with prior research conclusions in these areas: a) the importance of student interest in the topic; b) the need for more professional literature; and c) the need for improved and accessible curricular materials and texts. Respondents disagreed with prior research conclusions in rejecting the following as potential facilitators:
a) certification testing; b) stronger accreditation standards on gender equity instruction; and c) formal policies and program guidelines. The overcrowded curriculum was the most

frequently identified barrier in the open-ended responses, an observation which is also consistent with previous commentary.

Open-ended faculty responses in this study reveal a rich and remarkable variety of opinions. Most noteworthy about the responses was the almost total absence of self-satisfaction, complacency, or smugness. Respondents displayed an earnestness about teaching the subject to their students and frustration with the status quo. Although a population that would take the extra time to write lengthy comments might represent a group already predisposed to the topic, it should nevertheless be noted that their responses demonstrated sincere self-reflection and general soul-searching about how they might do a better job in teaching future teachers about gender equity.

As encouraging as these faculty comments are, however, they raise many concerns. Chief among these are the paradoxical and contradictory nature of the comments and the implied passivity and discounting of professional efficacy they suggest.

The first concern is this: If faculty members see gender equity instruction as an appropriate component throughout the teacher education curriculum, why, then, do they not include it in their own classes? The same individuals who indicated substantial support for gender equity instruction reported exceedingly low levels of actual instruction in their own classes. Was gender equity instruction considered appropriate for all courses--except, perhaps, their own?

A second concern is faculty's apparent belief that they have little control over the curriculum. The most commonly mentioned barrier was lack of time. Since these respondents are the ones who set the curriculum, why was there so little sense that it could be changed or that the importance of gender equity instruction might cause it to replace other features of the preservice curriculum?

Related to the issue of faculty autonomy--perhaps in an opposite way--is faculty rejection of external constraints. Professional literature, textbooks, student materials, and information from the popular media were favored more frequently than accreditation standards, certification requirements, formal policies, or faculty in-service programs. Further exploration of this area would be of value in understanding this perception, especially since certification and accreditation requirements have produced obvious changes in other aspects of the preservice curriculum.

A fourth concern is the weight given by faculty to student attitudes about gender equity instruction. Many respondents cited student apathy, lack of interest, resistance or overt hostility to gender-related topics as reasons for not including more coverage of gender issues in their classes. This apparent juxtaposition of responsibility perhaps requires further exploration. How, after all, would future teachers understand gender-related topics if they were not exposed to them?

A final concern—or irony--is how far apart student and faculty beliefs are from each other, yet also how close they are to each other. Open-ended comments clearly indicate that faculty would like to teach more about gender, and students would like to learn more about gender. Yet students believe faculty are disinterested in the topic, and faculty believes students are hostile to the topic.

Since all groups contain both genders, all equity areas are positively affected when preservice teachers acquire knowledge of how gender affects education. The results of these studies suggest that we are continuing to produce educators lacking the knowledge necessary to implement gender-equitable practices. They also suggest that faculty lack clarity about gender-related issues, and they also experience internal conflict about instructional implementation. We offer these final recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Gender issues should be infused in all aspects of the teacher education program and assessment rubrics established.

2. Gender issues should be emphasized across the university for both females and males.

3. Curricular decision-making in teacher education programs should be examined so that gender-related instruction is program-wide, not simply an individual faculty decision.

4. Faculty should engage in self-examination to resolve the apparent disparities between their professional beliefs and professional practices, as related to gender instruction.

5. Faculty and students should share their parallel desires to engage the topic of gender. Although students may appear outwardly hostile, their comments indicate a strong receptivity to the topic and regret that it is lacking in their classes.

Table 1: (Student Survey) Classes/Experiences Impacting Preservice Teachers' Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Gender-Equitable Classroom Practices

Classes/Experiences	N	% of Sample
Teacher Education Courses	289	38.1
Multicultural Education Courses	174	23.0
Women's Studies Courses	42	5.5
Major/Minor Courses	182	24.0
Self-Education	157	20.7
Nonacademic Sources	117	15.4
Specific Course or Professor	116	15.3

Table 2: (Faculty Survey) Preferred Curricular Approach

Which statement best reflects your opinion about preservice education?	N	%
1. Gender equity instruction should be provided in a separate course.	3	2.3
2. Gender equity instruction should be provided throughout the program.	102	77.9
3. Gender equity instruction should be provided in both of the above approaches.	25	19.1
4. Gender equity instruction should not be provided in preservice programs.	1	0.7

Table 3: (Faculty Survey) Potential Facilitators of Gender Equity Instruction

To what extent would (or do) the following increase the coverage of gender equity issues in your classes?	Not At All	Some what	Very Much
1. Texts, Materials	10.2%	62.5%	27.3%
2. Professional Literature	7.8%	57.0%	35.2%
3. General News, Media	14.1%	64.6%	21.3%
4. In-Service Seminars	20.3%	52.3%	27.4%
5. Certification Testing	47.2%	34.4%	18.4%
6. Accreditation Standards	41.7%	36.2%	22.1%
7. Formal Policies	28.3%	50.4%	21.3%
8. Colleague Support	14.8%	56.3%	28.9%
9. Administrative Support	12.5%	60.9%	26.6%
10. Student Interest	4.8%	52.4%	42.8%

Appendix A: (Student Survey) Sources of Knowledge/Sample Responses

Teacher Education Courses:

" (I learned) techniques to encourage all students to participate."

"All of them (courses) had some kind of impact on me."

"We learned that teachers are likely to call on males themselves."

"Professional education classes that required classroom experience--I learned from classroom teacher."

"Part of the program."

"Education courses touch on male/female roles, wait time, etc."

"In pre-student teaching I saw boys called on more than girls, boys treated harsher in punishment."

"Very little information."

"Mainly due to instructor."

Multicultural Education Courses:

"Saw a film on gender equity and discussed in class."

"We touched on gender as well as other types of equity."

"Mainly due to instructor."

"Had a big impact on my attitudes toward gender equity. I am more accepting than before."

"Centered on attitudes based on gender and race."

Women's Studies Courses:

"Reading *Ms.* magazine."

"Married to woman who minored in women's studies."

"Very little information."

Self-Education and Nonacademic Sources:

"As a mature adult, life experience goes a long way in identifying gender-equitable practices."

"Susan Faludi's *Backlash* and Naomi Wolf's *Beauty Myth*."

Appendix A: (Student Survey) Sources of Knowledge

Self-Education and Nonacademic Sources (continued):

"Family upbringing stressing non-prejudice."

"Christian teachings advocate sexual equality with agreed upon roles of male and female."

"My son taught me a lot about my own bias (as in) 'boys are tough.'"

"I am the mother of two girls and a Girl Scout leader."

"Many PBS specials."

"*60 Minutes*."

"I've always respected a woman's right to equality in everything."

"I have always felt women have been given a raw deal."

"*Dateline*."

"Daily functioning in American society can teach any bonehead about equity."

"Volunteer experiences."

"Simply being a female with brothers for siblings."

"Membership in Zonta."

"I was the first woman forestry supervisor in the (large city) Recreation Department."

"Growing up in a household of women."

"Family background."

Appendix B: (Faculty Survey) Facilitators and Barriers/SampleResponses

Facilitators:

"Having competent resource people speak to my students has been most beneficial."

"Older female students in class who are willing to speak up."

"The fact that our college has been strongly supporting multiculturalism, which has caused me to be more cognizant of a problem which I did not give adequate thought to previously. In textbooks, pamphlets, etc., when I see the gender equity topic, I am more likely to consider the information than in previous years."

Appendix B: (Faculty Survey) Facilitators and Barriers/Sample Responses

Facilitators (continued):

"I have a spouse very attuned to these issues; she has educated me greatly. I have two grown daughters and have been concerned about their futures. As a result, I have read quite a bit of feminist literature: Steinem, Rich, Bernard, etc., and have tried to keep current because I have been concerned about the mounting pressures on the U.S. family."

"Faculty members who are supportive of the issue of gender equity."

"A directory of guest speakers and their area of expertise for use in various classes and faculty inservices."

"Materials in texts, professional journals, news media."

"Articles written by female academics on non-gender specific topics."

"Student requests (for) gender equity issues."

"A philosophical statement by faculty that supports equity issues."

"An additional support has been our college's expectation that women's issues be taken seriously."

"The manner in which I conceptualize the ongoing process by which 'normal' is constructed."

"New standards on outcomes-based education from (accrediting body and state agency)."

Barriers:

There is so much to cover. Gender is only one area I must address. My responsibility is to all groups and helping all kids learn."

"Meeting university and state requirements for certification leaves no room for elective courses devoted to gender issues."

"I've never had a workshop--or anything--in gender equity."

"Lack of quality materials which are clearly written, research based, and easily accessible."

"Student resistance to the realities of gender inequity. Although my students are overwhelmingly female, they do not readily identify with the issues. Most have a decidedly anti-feminist orientation and tend to view advocates of gender equity as 'radical.'"

"From my perspective, I am 'dealing with the enemy' from day one. These students are replications of teachers from their pasts, with all the gender baggage securely and comfortably in place."

"I have been told by at least one male colleague in this college and by two of my male students that I am making 'too big a deal.' The professor went on to say the topic is not relevant anymore."

"An apparent lack of interest on the part of fellow educators, both male and female."

Appendix B: (Faculty Survey) Facilitators and Barriers/Sample Responses

Barriers (continued):

"The current 'accountability' of NCATE pressure helps shape the curriculum, with a heavy emphasis on instructional research and practice available. Gender equity is seen as a peripheral aspect of any class."

"Male faculty members and students who view any discussion of gender equity issues pertaining to women and children as 'male-bashing.'"

I need to do more reading, perhaps. Some of the gender equity topics presented (in this survey) had not previously occurred to me."

"It is not a strong component, primarily because I think good teaching will facilitate learning in both males and females."

Enforcement (testing, accreditation, in-services) is a mistake. Those who disagree will undermine the process; those who agree are doing it already."

"A fear of being viewed as a radical feminist and the put-downs and labeling that go along with it. Even girls themselves are socialized to believe they have no voice."

General Comments:

"My emphasis is not just on equity. As a radical feminist, I disagree with the limited views for women sponsored by liberal feminists. I do believe that an examination of feminism is essential to enable women and men to break through the public backlash against advances for women."

"I've been thinking that courses which provide for strong relationship building are helpful to most girls. My women's journals talk so much about not trusting, not believing in themselves. It's scary!"

"I don't think much about (gender equity). Competent females model achievement and equity for their students. In the greater society, for K-12 students as well as college students, it is a problem of family values and church values."

"I feel that there are so many groups trying to gain equity. I hope that the different causes don't overwhelm people. As a teacher, one must be prepared to deal with gender as well as race, and maybe even religion. It's tough."

"As a teacher and field coordinator, I need to be mentor and counselor. Do I want to also be the feminist conscience from hell? Can I do both? How?"

References

Alton-Lee, A., Densem, P., & Nuthall, G. (1991). Imperatives of classroom research: Understanding what children learn about gender and race. In J. Morss & T. Linzey (Eds.), *Growing up: The politics of human learning* (pp. 93-117). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Paul.

American Association of University Women. (1992). *The AAUW report: How schools shortchange girls*. Washington, DC: Author.

Baenninger, M., & Newcombe, N. (1989). The role of experience in spatial test performance: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles, 20*, 327-344.

Baker, D. (1986). Sex differences in classroom interactions in secondary science. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 22*, 212-218.

Banfield, B. (1988). Sex, race and disability: Triple threat to educational equity for girls and women. In M. Froschl & B. Sprung (Eds.), *Resources for educational equity: A guide for grades prekindergarten-12* (pp. xxiv-xxvii). New York: Garland.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. M. (1992). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Baptiste, H. P. (1990). Introduction: The challenge of preparing for equity. In H. P. Baptiste (Ed.), *Leadership, equity, and school effectiveness* (pp. 209-212). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Biklen, S., & Pollard, D. (Eds.) (1993). *Gender and education*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Brophy, J. (1985). Interactions of male and female students with male and female teachers. In L. Wilkinson & C. Marrett (Eds.), *Gender influences in classroom interaction* (pp. 115-142). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Campbell, J., Voekl, K., & Donahue, P. (1997, August). Report in brief: NAEP 1996 trends in academic progress. [WWW document]. URL *http://www.ed.gov/NCES/NAEP/96report/97986.shtml*.

Center research reveals how schools shortchange girls. (1992, Spring). *Research Report, 11*(2). Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Davis, G., & Thomas, M. (1989). *Effective schools and effective teachers*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Eccles, J. (1989). Bringing young women to math and science. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 36-58). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37*, 15-18.

Fennema, E., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teacher-student interactions and sex-related differences in learning mathematics. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2*(3), 19-42.

Gay, G. (1990). Teacher preparation for equity. In H. P. Baptiste (Ed.), *Leadership, equity, and school effectiveness* (pp. 224-243). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ginsburg, M., & Clift, R. (1990). The hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education. In W. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 450-465), NY: Macmillan.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Harper.

Grant, C., & Koskala, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 197-204.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

Grayson, D., & Martin, M. (1990). *GESA: Gender/ethnic expectations and student achievement teacher handbook* (Rev. ed.). Des Moines, IA: Graymill.

Grayson, D. (1987). *Evaluating the impact of the GESA program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 881)

Grossman, H., & Grossman, S. (1994). *Gender issues in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hanson, K. (1992, July). *Teaching mathematics effectively and equitably to females* (The Center for Equity & Cultural Diversity Working Paper No. 1). Newton, MA: Education Development Center.

Henington, M. (1981). Effect of intensive multicultural non-sexist instruction on secondary student teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly, 6*(1),65-75.

Hilke, E., & Conway-Gerhardt, C. (1994). *Gender equity in education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Horgan, D. (1995). *Achieving gender equity: Strategies for the classroom*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Howe, F. (1979). The first decade of women's studies. *Harvard Educational Review, 49*, 413-421.

Jones, M. (1989). Gender issues in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(1), 33-38.

Jungwirth, H. (1991). Interaction and gender findings of a micro-ethnographical approach to classroom discourse. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 22*, 263-284.

Lather, P. (1983). Feminism, teacher education and curricular change: Women's studies as counter-hegemonic work. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44*, 3182A-3183A. (University Microfilms No. 8401606).

Lerner, G. (1981). *Teaching women's history*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association.

Maccoby, E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist, 45*, 513-520.

Mader, C. (1994). Gender equity instruction in Michigan teacher education programs. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*, 1917A (University Microfilms No. 9431288).

Mader, C., & King, C. (April, 1995). *Awareness of gender equity within teacher education programs*. Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco, CA.

Mader, C., & Sanders, J. (July, 1994). *Equity issues in teacher education programs.* Annual Meeting of the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, Olympia, WA.

Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. (1994). *The feminist classroom.* NY: Harper Collins.

Martin, R., & Lock, R. (1991, Summer). Confronting realities: Cultural reproduction in physical education an analysis of nonsexist behaviors of student teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, pp. 45-55.

Masland, S. (1992, October). *Gender and ethnic awareness in teacher education.* Paper presented at "Taking the Lead: Balancing the Educational Equation," conference co-sponsored by California American Association of University Women and Mills College, Oakland CA.

McCune, S., & Matthews, M. (1975a). Eliminating sexism: Teacher education and change. *Journal of Teacher Education, 26*, 294-300.

McCune, S., & Matthews, M. (1975b). Women's studies and teacher education: Actuality and potential, *Journal of Teacher Education, 26,* 340-344.

McIntosh, P. (1984). Interactive phases of curricular re-vision. In B. Spanier, A. Bloom, & D. Boroviak (Eds.), *Toward a balanced curriculum* (pp. 25-35). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education. (1989). *A review of the at-risk literature with special emphasis on female students: A research summary.* Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education. (1992). *The influence of gender-role socialization on student perceptions.* Lansing, MI: Author.

Moody, J., & Gifford, V. (1990, November). *The effect of grouping by formal reasoning ability, formal reasoning ability levels, group size and gender on achievement in laboratory chemistry.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. 326 443).

National Science Foundation. (1990). *Women and minorities in science and engineering.* Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Nelson, C. (1990). Gender and the social studies: Training preservice secondary social studies teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*, 730A-731A. (University Microfilms No. 9021339)

Page, S., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). Sex and expectations of teachers and sex and race of students as determinants of teaching behavior and student performance. *Journal of School Psychology, 28*, 119-131.

Pflaum, S., Pascarella, E., Boswick, M., & Auer, C. (1980). The influence of pupil behaviors and pupil status on teacher behaviors during oral reading lessons. *Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 99-105.

Pryor, S. (1997). Preservice teacher attitudes and knowledge of gender-equitable teaching methods. In Symposium Proceedings, *Gender and race on the campus and in the school: Beyond affirmative action* (pp. 275-287). Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women.

Pryor, S. (1996). Preservice teacher preparation and leadership for gender equity. *Dissertation Abstracts International, "55,* 1917A" (University Microfilms No.).

Purcell, P., & Stewart, L. (1990). Dick and Jane 1989. *Sex Roles, 22*, 177-185.

Putnam, S., & Self, P. (1988). *Social play in toddlers: Teacher intrusions*. Greensboro: University of North Carolina. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 529)

Riley, L., Baldus, L., Nelson, O., Schuler, B., & Keyes, M. (1993, February). *"My worst nightmare...": Wisconsin students' perceptions of being the other gender*. Menomonie, WI: University of Wisconsin-Stout, Center for Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.

Rose, T., & Dunne, F. (1989). Gender equity for a new generation: Teacher educators can make a difference. *Contemporary Education, 61*, 29-31.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1980). Sexism in teacher education texts. *Harvard Educational Review, 50*, 36-46.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1981). The development and field trial of a non-sexist teacher education curriculum. *High School Journal, 64*, 331-336.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1982). *Sex equity handbook for schools*. New York: Longman.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1986). Sexism in the classroom: From grade school to graduate school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*, 512-515.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1989). *The report card #1: The cost of sex bias in schools and society*. Washington, DC: Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Klein, S. (1991). The issue of gender in elementary and secondary education. In C. Grand (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, 17* (pp. 269-334). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Sanders, J. (May, 1997). Teacher education and gender equity. *ERIC Digest, 96*(3).

Shakeshaft, C. (1986). A gender at risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*, 495-503.

Sleeter, C. (1993). Power and privilege in white middle-class feminist discussions of gender and education. In S.K. Biklen & D.Pollard (Eds.), *Gender and education*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Smith, N., Greenlaw, M., & Scott, C. (1987). Making the literate environment equitable. *Reading Teacher, 40*, 400-407.

Stein, N. (1992, November 4). School harassment: An update. *Education Week*, p. 37.

Stein, N. (1993). It happens here too: Sexual harassment and child sexual abuse in elementary and secondary schools. In S. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), *Gender and education* (pp. 191-203). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Stewart, L. (1992, March 27). Better training seen as solution: Colleges try improving qualifications. *Detroit Free Press*, pp. 1A, 13A.

Streitmatter, J. (1994). *Toward gender equity in the classroom: Everyday teachers' beliefs and practices*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stromquist, N. (1989, July). *The state and gender equity in U.S. education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Cambridge, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 850).

Styer, S. (1982). *Women's studies courses in teacher education* Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 262).

Tetreault, M. (1985). Phases of thinking about women in history: A report card on the textbook. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 13*(3/4), 35-47.

Titus, J. (1993). Gender messages in education foundations textbooks. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*, 38-43.

White, P. (1992, January). *Women and minorities in science and engineering: An update.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 034)

Whyte, J. (1984). Observing sex stereotypes and interactions in the school lab and workshop. *Educational Review, 36*(1), 75-86.

Wilkinson, L., Lindow, J., & Chiang, C. (1985). Sex differences and sex segregation in students' small-group communication. In L. Wilkinson & C. Marrett (Eds.), *Gender influences in classroom interaction* (pp. 185-207). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Wilson, C. (1993, August). *Gender equity components in preservice teacher education programs.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, Ann Arbor, MI.

Woolever, R. (1981, November). *Sex equity in teacher education.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly, Detroit, MI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 416).

GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:

WHAT DO STUDENTS LEARN? WHAT DO FACULTY TEACH? WHAT ARE THE INFLUENCES?

Sherrill Evenson Pryor, Ed.D.
Cynthia E. Mader, Ph.D.

Grand Valley State University
School of Education
Allendale, Michigan 49401
(616) 771-6646

Internet: pryors@gvsu.edu
Internet: maderc@gvsu.edu

American Educational Research Association (AERA)
Annual Meeting
San Diego, California
April 16, 1998

Gender Equity Instruction In Teacher Education:
What Do Students Learn? What Do Faculty Teach? What Are the Influences?

Abstract

Findings in this paper are part of larger efforts by two researchers. This paper examines education students' perceptions of gender-related knowledge sources, faculty attitudes and preferred curricular approaches in gender-equity instruction, and faculty perceptions of facilitators and barriers to gender-equity instruction.

The subjects of the research were from one midwestern state. In one study there were 758 preservice students at three separate universities and in the other study there were 247 full-time teacher education faculty members in the professional programs of 29 preservice teacher education programs. Open-ended comments were requested from both students and faculty. Students identified sources of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices while faculty identified their preferred curricular approach to gender-related instruction and ranked ten factors facilitating instruction.

Findings indicate that teacher education classes were the most frequently mentioned source of students' knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices (38%) and women's studies courses were the least frequently mentioned source of students' knowledge (5.5%). In the faculty study, almost 78% of the faculty said gender-related instruction should be integrated throughout the curriculum. The most frequently chosen facilitator of gender-equity instruction mentioned by faculty was student interest. The least frequently chosen facilitators were state licensing and national accreditation requirements.

Roundtable presented at the Annual Meeting of AERA, San Diego, CA, April 16, 1998 by Sherrill Evenson Pryor, EdD. and Cynthia E. Mader, PhD. Grand Valley State University, Grand Rapids, MI.

GENDER EQUITY INSTRUCTION IN TEACHER EDUCATION:

WHAT DO STUDENTS LEARN? WHAT DO FACULTY TEACH? WHAT ARE THE INFLUENCES?

Objectives

Although almost a quarter-century of research has confirmed the presence of gender bias affecting female students in K-12 education (AAUW, 1992; Campbell, Voelkl, & Donahue, 1997; Sadker & Sadker, 1994), studies conducted during the 1970's and 1980's suggested the absence of gender equity instruction in teacher education programs. This absence existed despite the self-evident logic of teacher education as a starting place for such instruction and despite the documented effectiveness of such instruction in reducing gender bias in future teachers.

More recently, gender concerns have become part of the national discourse, and diversity education has become standard in many K-12 and teacher education programs. Nevertheless, studies of teacher education curricula conducted during the 1970's and extending into the 1990's confirmed that gender-related instruction remained limited or non-existent.

The findings detailed in these pages are part of larger efforts by the two researchers to also ascertain the actual extent of faculty instruction and student knowledge on issues of gender. These background findings will be summarized here, but the primary focus of this effort will be to examine the reasons for this lack of attention and identify factors which will increase faculty instruction and student knowledge. The following questions guided this effort:

1. What did students perceive to be the sources of their gender-related knowledge?

2. What were faculty attitudes and preferred curricular approaches toward gender equity instruction in their classes?

3. What did faculty perceive to be facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction?

Literature/Theoretical Framework

Concern with and interest in gender has been so ubiquitous in the 1990's that it is tempting to regard the topic as new and revolutionary. Fueled by controversial court cases involving elected officials and even a Supreme Court nominee, and popularized by

television commentators and newspaper reporters, issues involving gender have stimulated national discourse, discussion and debate (Center Research, 1992).

In 1972, legislative reform beginning with Title IX had drawn attention to improving K-12 educational practices (Stromquist, 1989). Numerous works by feminist scholars contributed philosophical and psychological foundations for analyses of gender in education (Gilligan, 1982; Lerner, 1981; Maher & Tetreault, 1994; McIntosh, 1984, Tetreault, 1985). Excellent reviews of the literature exist in several sources: AAUW, 1992; Biklen & Pollard, 1993; Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; Grant & Secada, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1994; Sadker, Sadker & Klein, 1991; Sanders, 1997.

Providing the framework for the student study described here was the area of gender-equitable classroom practices. This area consisted of three categories (teacher expectations, teacher interactions, and classroom management/organization), factors found to influence high achievement (Davis & Thomas, 1989; Edmonds, 1979; Good & Brophy, 1987).

Teacher expectations are discussed in the AAUW report (1992) as one of many factors leading to 69% of elementary males and 60% of elementary females expressing happiness with themselves, compared to a subsequent decline when 46% of high school males and only 29% of high school females express happiness with themselves. Teacher expectations have been found to allow for little variation in student differences. Boys represent 71% of the identified learning-disabled students, a majority of early grade retentions, and 80% of those students labeled emotionally disturbed (Sadker & Sadker, 1989; 1994). In a 1991 study 74% of Michigan students expressed belief that boys and girls were treated differently. These same students thought that males' lives were easier and more fun and that females were often demeaned (Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education, 1992). Similar findings appear in a Wisconsin study of 3,363 students (Riley, Baldus, Nelson, Schuler, & Keyes, 1993).

In the area of teacher interactions, researchers have consistently found that male students demand and receive more teacher attention, both positive and negative (Eccles, 1989; Fennema & Peterson, 1986; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Putnam & Self, 1988; Sadker & Sadker, 1982, 1986, 1994). Interactions in forty math classrooms coded over a period of ten days revealed an imbalance of interactions. Over half of the students had no interactions with the teacher while the rest of the class, the majority of whom were male, had fourteen or more interactions (Eccles, 1989). Jungwirth (1991) concluded that teachers glossed over mathematics errors with males and magnified them with females. High-achieving females received the largest number of discouraging statements and least amount of praise (Purcell & Stewart, 1990). According to Streitmatter (1994) gender differentiated attitudes may be reinforced due to the bias of the English language. Disparity of interactions can be seen across subject areas (Baker, 1986; Banks & Banks, 1992; Fennema & Peterson, 1986; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Pflaum et al., 1980). Statements about the quality and content of work effort are used more frequently with

males, whereas females receive low ability statements about effort and about the form of their work (Grayson, 1987).

The physical and emotional classroom environment affects gender equity efforts. Authors and publishers still use male pronouns to describe individuals whose gender is unknown, history books contain few role models for females, and literature portrays females as helpless and males as adventuresome (AAUW, 1992; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1986, 1994; Smith, Greenlaw, & Scott, 1987; Tetreault, 1985). Martin and Lock (1991) found that preservice physical education teachers displayed little knowledge of gender-equitable teaching strategies and had little information regarding Title IX rights. Teachers tend to choose methods, materials and curriculum favoring the needs of males (AAUW, 1992; Baenninger & Newcombe, 1989; Shakeshaft, 1986). A study of a third grade classroom learning about the Middle Ages revealed that students were told about three males each minute and one female every six minutes. When interviewed, students could not remember the females from the lesson (Alton-Lee, Densem, & Nuthall, 1991).

Report card grades are lower for males than for females, yet males performed better on math placement tests (Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Few females are in remedial programs, and when they are referred they are older and farther behind (Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education, 1989). Females are more likely to be placed in lower math groups than appropriate for their test scores (National Science Foundation, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1994). Sexual harassment by either gender meets with little interference from teachers or administrators (Stein, 1992, 1993; Thorne, 1993). The message of language, curricular materials, classroom grouping and classroom management is a stereotypical message for both genders (AAUW, 1992; Grossman & Grossman, 1994; Sadker & Sadker, 1994).

Pryor (1996, 1997) conducted background research with 758 preservice students in conjunction with the efforts described later in this report and with the same sample of preservice students. Data revealed a low level of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices. Preservice students correctly answered fewer than 50% of the items on the 37-item assessment instrument. Frequency distribution revealed that only 7.3% of the sample preservice students correctly answered 75% or more of the items on the assessment, and 10% of these same preservice students correctly answered nine or fewer items.

Teacher education programs offered a natural starting point for addressing gender issues in education. Evidence from experimental studies bolstered the belief that preservice students could learn valuable strategies if exposed to them. Although limited in number, these findings demonstrated that students who were exposed to gender-equitable strategies gained in knowledge and attitudes; incorporated more scholarship on women in their curricula; engaged in a greater number of equitable teaching behaviors; and reported experiencing critical insights into gender-related issues (Grant & Secada, 1990; Henington, 1981; Nelson, 1990; Sadker & Sadker, 1981; Sleeter, 1993).

Teacher educators, however, were slow to integrate gender issues into the curriculum. Early research revealed that teacher education programs rarely mandated or integrated gender instruction in their programs. Few programs addressed it all. Of those that did, few offered separate courses related to gender in education; these courses were elective, integration of gender issues into the preservice curriculum was limited; students and faculty colleagues were indifferent or hostile; and few programs assessed competence in gender-fair teaching strategies (Lather, 1983; McCune & Matthews, 1975b; Sadker, 1981; Styer, 1982; Woolever, 1981). Howe's (1979) pronouncement that schools of education were "among the most resistant to the impact of the women's movement" remained accurate into the 1990's.

More recently, Wilson (1993) surveyed administrators of 547 teacher education programs with NCATE accreditation. Of the 200 respondents, 54% reported no gender component in their preservice program. Wilson's preliminary data indicated that accreditation was not necessarily associated with the inclusion of instruction on gender issues; multicultural courses were more prevalent than separate courses; elective courses predominated; programmatic guidelines for gender equity instruction were not prevalent; and assessment was rare.

Mader (1994) conducted background research in conjunction with the efforts described later in this report and with the same faculty population. Teacher education faculty were found to be staunch advocates of instruction on gender issues. Some 98% advocated inclusion of gender-related instruction, but only 8% provided in-depth instruction in their own classes. Also found were limited evidence of program-wide instruction on gender, little ongoing faculty discussion of the topic, limited administrative support, and few policy statements or program guidelines (Mader & King, 1995; Mader & Sanders, 1994).

Numerous suggestions have been given for the dearth of gender-related instruction in teacher education. Most frequent are lack of professional literature; absence of suitable textbooks; weak certification and accreditation standards; overcrowded curriculum; student resistance; faculty and administrative indifference; male-defined educational theory; over-representation of males in school leadership and teacher education faculty; over-representation of "good girls" in the teaching rank and file; and the tendency of traditional teacher education to be reproductive rather than reconstructive in nature (Ginsburg & Clift, 1990; Grant & Secada, 1990; Lather, 1983; Masland, 1992; McCune & Matthews, 1975a; Rose & Dunne, 1989; Sadker & Sadker, 1980; Titus, 1993).

Methodology/Data Collection

Two instruments were devised--one for preservice students, one for preservice faculty. The research was conducted in one midwestern state which provides a large cadre of new teachers each year; two of the state's programs ranked sixth and seventh in the nation in enrollment (American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, cited in Stewart, 1992).

The preservice student subjects were 758 preservice teachers at three large universities in the state. Students in the sample were attending their required student teaching orientation session. Demographic data collected on the sample of 758 subjects revealed that 214 identified themselves as males, 529 as females, and 15 gave no identifying response. A chi-square goodness of fit analysis with the population of practicing teachers (Statistical Abstract, 1995, p.77) revealed no differences between the sample and the teacher population on the variables of gender ($X^2(1)=1.09$, $p=.05$) or ethnicity ($X^2(4)=8.29$, $p=.05$). Data were gathered on site by the researcher or an associate. The part of the instrument discussed in this report requested that the respondents identify and describe their sources of knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices from a list of seven options.

The Faculty Survey Instrument was sent to the 247 full-time teacher education faculty members teaching in the professional programs of 29 preservice teacher education institutions in the state. This number included all the approved programs in the state except two, one of which served as the faculty pilot study institution, the other of which was undergoing substantial curricular change at the time of the study. The institutions were both publicly and privately funded; some were accredited by national organizations, some were not; they ranged in size from 15 to 700 teacher education graduates per year. Faculty from 28 of the 29 institutions responded, with an overall response rate of 53% and a median institutional response rate of 65%. The parts of the instrument under discussion in this report contained a preliminary section eliciting demographic information and three sections on preferred curricular approaches and perceived facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction.

The faculty demographic profile showed an established, traditional faculty representing a wide range of institutions. More than 44% of the respondents were over the age of fifty. Caucasians comprised 90% of the respondents. Almost 42% were tenured, 28% tenure track, and 30% "other." Approximately 23% were full professors, 26% associate, 31% assistant, 20% "other." A variety of teaching areas was represented: foundations, methods, clinical, and psychology and human development. More females (56%) than males (44%) responded although the instrument was sent to males and females in nearly equal proportion. Public and private institutions were well represented, as were large and small programs, accredited and not.

Results

The results of these studies give insight into preservice students' sources of knowledge, faculty attitudes, preferred curricular approaches, and perceived facilitators of gender equity instruction. Student responses revealed the power of classroom instruction to influence their knowledge both positively and negatively. Data also revealed strong faculty support for inclusion of gender equity instruction and clear preferences for factors likely to increase such instruction. Before presenting the variety of open-ended student and faculty responses, quantitative data might better reveal the overall pattern of responses.

Student data revealed that more preservice teachers (38%) identified teacher education classes as the source of their knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices than any other factor. Some 24% identified classes in their major/minor, 23% classes in multicultural education. Over 20% identified self-education and 15% nonacademic sources as the ways in which they learned about gender-equitable classroom practices. Another 15% identified a specific course or professor, and only 5.5% identified women's studies courses (Table 1).

Faculty were asked to identify their preferred curricular approach for gender-related instruction from among four choices: a) separate courses, b) integrated courses, c) dual approach--separate and integrated, d) no coverage of gender-related instruction. Almost 78% said it should be integrated throughout the curriculum. Only one respondent said it had no place in the curriculum of future teachers (Table 2).

Faculty were also asked to rank ten factors on whether they would increase the amount of gender equity instruction. These potential facilitators were drawn from the literature noted earlier. Student interest was the facilitator chosen most frequently by faculty. Other facilitators which appeared at least somewhat potent were professional literature, texts and materials, general news and media coverage, and administrative support. Factors considered least facilitative were certification tests, accreditation requirements, in-service seminars, and formal program policies (Table 3).

Open-ended comments from both students and faculty represented a wide variety of opinions--most encouraging, some contradictory, and a few frustrating in their seemingly unexamined assumptions.

Students most frequently identified their teacher education classes as having the most influence on their knowledge of gender-equitable classroom practices. They cited courses in social foundations, curriculum, teaching methods, and psychology. Comments on their multicultural education courses indicated that, in one university at least, multicultural education studies were equated with African American literature and African American studies. At the other two universities where multicultural courses were mentioned, gender equity was often a part of the course. When identifying courses in their major/minor as the source of knowledge about gender, courses varied from university to university, but respondents at all three listed math, science, special education and physical education courses. Women's studies was identified by only a small number of respondents, but self-education and nonacademic sources were identified by many. Respondents frequently listed news media, family and books as influencing their knowledge about gender-equitable classroom practices (Appendix A).

Faculty were asked three open-ended questions to elicit further comment on facilitators and obstacles to gender equity instruction and for additional thoughts on the topic not covered in other ways in the instrument. In its printed format, the entire verbatim transcript of open-ended faculty responses comprised almost 20 pages. In naming

facilitators, faculty noted that they would be greatly assisted by good research and materials, good texts, good journal articles, and other supportive information upon which to base student assignments. In terms of barriers to the inclusion of gender equity instruction, there was considerable consensus that time constraints and an overcrowded curriculum had a negative effect. Many individuals mentioned this either directly or indirectly. Another constraint was noted to be student disinterest or outright resistance to the topic. Some respondents even noted their own ignorance and biases as significant barriers (Appendix C).

Conclusions/Educational Importance

The results of these studies corroborate earlier research showing that teacher education programs continue to lag behind in the study of gender issues--this despite almost a quarter century of public and scholarly attention and despite professed enthusiasm for such instruction by faculty.

Students are not consistently learning about the importance of this area of study in their teacher education classes, multicultural classes, and major/minor classes. Some preservice students observed gender-equitable classroom practices during their pre-student teaching experience while others observed inequitable practices. Reason for optimism is noted in some comments that stated all courses had an impact on their knowledge and that specific teaching strategies were discussed. In addition, major/minor classes in traditionally male-dominated areas and special education are addressing issues of gender equity.

Providing less cause for optimism are student comments that gender-equitable classroom practices receive very little coverage, are "touched on" or are dependent on the course instructor. Major/minor areas that are traditionally female-dominated were absent from the comments. Finally, multicultural studies were frequently equated with African American studies, yet equity should include all cultural groups.

Many students rely on self education, nonacademic sources, and "real life" experiences, e.g., television specials, to learn about gender-equitable practices. Many students believe that no special training is needed, as evidenced in one open-ended comment that life can teach "any bonehead" about equity. It should also be noted that students have volunteer and family experiences that have taught them about gender and which should be applauded and encouraged by teacher education programs.

Faculty responses about facilitators and barriers to gender equity instruction were generally consistent with the literature although some differences were apparent. Respondents agreed with prior research conclusions in these areas: a) the importance of student interest in the topic; b) the need for more professional literature; and c) the need for improved and accessible curricular materials and texts. Respondents disagreed with prior research conclusions in rejecting the following as potential facilitators: a) certification testing; b) stronger accreditation standards on gender equity instruction; and c) formal policies and program guidelines. The overcrowded curriculum was the most

frequently identified barrier in the open-ended responses, an observation which is also consistent with previous commentary.

Open-ended faculty responses in this study reveal a rich and remarkable variety of opinions. Most noteworthy about the responses was the almost total absence of self-satisfaction, complacency, or smugness. Respondents displayed an earnestness about teaching the subject to their students and frustration with the status quo. Although a population that would take the extra time to write lengthy comments might represent a group already predisposed to the topic, it should nevertheless be noted that their responses demonstrated sincere self-reflection and general soul-searching about how they might do a better job in teaching future teachers about gender equity.

As encouraging as these faculty comments are, however, they raise many concerns. Chief among these are the paradoxical and contradictory nature of the comments and the implied passivity and discounting of professional efficacy they suggest.

The first concern is this: If faculty members see gender equity instruction as an appropriate component throughout the teacher education curriculum, why, then, do they not include it in their own classes? The same individuals who indicated substantial support for gender equity instruction reported exceedingly low levels of actual instruction in their own classes. Was gender equity instruction considered appropriate for all courses--except, perhaps, their own?

A second concern is faculty's apparent belief that they have little control over the curriculum. The most commonly mentioned barrier was lack of time. Since these respondents are the ones who set the curriculum, why was there so little sense that it could be changed or that the importance of gender equity instruction might cause it to replace other features of the preservice curriculum?

Related to the issue of faculty autonomy--perhaps in an opposite way--is faculty rejection of external constraints. Professional literature, textbooks, student materials, and information from the popular media were favored more frequently than accreditation standards, certification requirements, formal policies, or faculty in-service programs. Further exploration of this area would be of value in understanding this perception, especially since certification and accreditation requirements have produced obvious changes in other aspects of the preservice curriculum.

A fourth concern is the weight given by faculty to student attitudes about gender equity instruction. Many respondents cited student apathy, lack of interest, resistance or overt hostility to gender-related topics as reasons for not including more coverage of gender issues in their classes. This apparent juxtaposition of responsibility perhaps requires further exploration. How, after all, would future teachers understand gender-related topics if they were not exposed to them?

A final concern—or irony--is how far apart student and faculty beliefs are from each other, yet also how close they are to each other. Open-ended comments clearly indicate that faculty would like to teach more about gender, and students would like to learn more about gender. Yet students believe faculty are disinterested in the topic, and faculty believes students are hostile to the topic.

Since all groups contain both genders, all equity areas are positively affected when preservice teachers acquire knowledge of how gender affects education. The results of these studies suggest that we are continuing to produce educators lacking the knowledge necessary to implement gender-equitable practices. They also suggest that faculty lack clarity about gender-related issues, and they also experience internal conflict about instructional implementation. We offer these final recommendations.

Recommendations

1. Gender issues should be infused in all aspects of the teacher education program and assessment rubrics established.

2. Gender issues should be emphasized across the university for both females and males.

3. Curricular decision-making in teacher education programs should be examined so that gender-related instruction is program-wide, not simply an individual faculty decision.

4. Faculty should engage in self-examination to resolve the apparent disparities between their professional beliefs and professional practices, as related to gender instruction.

5. Faculty and students should share their parallel desires to engage the topic of gender. Although students may appear outwardly hostile, their comments indicate a strong receptivity to the topic and regret that it is lacking in their classes.

Table 1: (Student Survey) Classes/Experiences Impacting Preservice Teachers' Knowledge and Attitudes Regarding Gender-Equitable Classroom Practices

Classes/Experiences	N	% of Sample
Teacher Education Courses	289	38.1
Multicultural Education Courses	174	23.0
Women's Studies Courses	42	5.5
Major/Minor Courses	182	24.0
Self-Education	157	20.7
Nonacademic Sources	117	15.4
Specific Course or Professor	116	15.3

Table 2: (Faculty Survey) Preferred Curricular Approach

Which statement best reflects your opinion about preservice education?	N	%
1. Gender equity instruction should be provided in a separate course.	3	2.3
2. Gender equity instruction should be provided throughout the program.	102	77.9
3. Gender equity instruction should be provided in both of the above approaches.	25	19.1
4. Gender equity instruction should not be provided in preservice programs.	1	0.7

Table 3: (Faculty Survey) Potential Facilitators of Gender Equity Instruction

To what extent would (or do) the following increase the coverage of gender equity issues in your classes?	Not At All	Some what	Very Much
1. Texts, Materials	10.2%	62.5%	27.3%
2. Professional Literature	7.8%	57.0%	35.2%
3. General News, Media	14.1%	64.6%	21.3%
4. In-Service Seminars	20.3%	52.3%	27.4%
5. Certification Testing	47.2%	34.4%	18.4%
6. Accreditation Standards	41.7%	36.2%	22.1%
7. Formal Policies	28.3%	50.4%	21.3%
8. Colleague Support	14.8%	56.3%	28.9%
9. Administrative Support	12.5%	60.9%	26.6%
10. Student Interest	4.8%	52.4%	42.8%

Appendix A: (Student Survey) Sources of Knowledge/Sample Responses

Teacher Education Courses:

" (I learned) techniques to encourage all students to participate."

"All of them (courses) had some kind of impact on me."

"We learned that teachers are likely to call on males themselves."

"Professional education classes that required classroom experience--I learned from classroom teacher."

"Part of the program."

"Education courses touch on male/female roles, wait time, etc."

"In pre-student teaching I saw boys called on more than girls, boys treated harsher in punishment."

"Very little information."

"Mainly due to instructor."

Multicultural Education Courses:

"Saw a film on gender equity and discussed in class."

"We touched on gender as well as other types of equity."

"Mainly due to instructor."

"Had a big impact on my attitudes toward gender equity. I am more accepting than before."

"Centered on attitudes based on gender and race."

Women's Studies Courses:

"Reading *Ms.* magazine."

"Married to woman who minored in women's studies."

"Very little information."

Self-Education and Nonacademic Sources:

"As a mature adult, life experience goes a long way in identifying gender-equitable practices."

"Susan Faludi's *Backlash* and Naomi Wolf's *Beauty Myth*."

Appendix A: (Student Survey) Sources of Knowledge

Self-Education and Nonacademic Sources (continued):

"Family upbringing stressing non-prejudice."

"Christian teachings advocate sexual equality with agreed upon roles of male and female."

"My son taught me a lot about my own bias (as in) 'boys are tough.'"

"I am the mother of two girls and a Girl Scout leader."

"Many PBS specials."

"*60 Minutes*."

"I've always respected a woman's right to equality in everything."

"I have always felt women have been given a raw deal."

"*Dateline*."

"Daily functioning in American society can teach any bonehead about equity."

"Volunteer experiences."

"Simply being a female with brothers for siblings."

"Membership in Zonta."

"I was the first woman forestry supervisor in the (large city) Recreation Department."

"Growing up in a household of women."

"Family background."

Appendix B: (Faculty Survey) Facilitators and Barriers/SampleResponses

Facilitators:

"Having competent resource people speak to my students has been most beneficial."

"Older female students in class who are willing to speak up."

"The fact that our college has been strongly supporting multiculturalism, which has caused me to be more cognizant of a problem which I did not give adequate thought to previously. In textbooks, pamphlets, etc., when I see the gender equity topic, I am more likely to consider the information than in previous years."

Appendix B: (Faculty Survey) Facilitators and Barriers/Sample Responses

Facilitators (continued):

"I have a spouse very attuned to these issues; she has educated me greatly. I have two grown daughters and have been concerned about their futures. As a result, I have read quite a bit of feminist literature: Steinem, Rich, Bernard, etc., and have tried to keep current because I have been concerned about the mounting pressures on the U.S. family."

"Faculty members who are supportive of the issue of gender equity."

"A directory of guest speakers and their area of expertise for use in various classes and faculty inservices."

"Materials in texts, professional journals, news media."

"Articles written by female academics on non-gender specific topics."

"Student requests (for) gender equity issues."

"A philosophical statement by faculty that supports equity issues."

"An additional support has been our college's expectation that women's issues be taken seriously."

"The manner in which I conceptualize the ongoing process by which 'normal' is constructed."

"New standards on outcomes-based education from (accrediting body and state agency)."

Barriers:

There is so much to cover. Gender is only one area I must address. My responsibility is to all groups and helping all kids learn."

"Meeting university and state requirements for certification leaves no room for elective courses devoted to gender issues."

"I've never had a workshop--or anything--in gender equity."

"Lack of quality materials which are clearly written, research based, and easily accessible."

"Student resistance to the realities of gender inequity. Although my students are overwhelmingly female, they do not readily identify with the issues. Most have a decidedly anti-feminist orientation and tend to view advocates of gender equity as 'radical.'"

"From my perspective, I am 'dealing with the enemy' from day one. These students are replications of teachers from their pasts, with all the gender baggage securely and comfortably in place."

"I have been told by at least one male colleague in this college and by two of my male students that I am making 'too big a deal.' The professor went on to say the topic is not relevant anymore."

"An apparent lack of interest on the part of fellow educators, both male and female."

Appendix B: (Faculty Survey) Facilitators and Barriers/Sample Responses

Barriers (continued):

"The current 'accountability' of NCATE pressure helps shape the curriculum, with a heavy emphasis on instructional research and practice available. Gender equity is seen as a peripheral aspect of any class."

"Male faculty members and students who view any discussion of gender equity issues pertaining to women and children as 'male-bashing.'"

I need to do more reading, perhaps. Some of the gender equity topics presented (in this survey) had not previously occurred to me."

"It is not a strong component, primarily because I think good teaching will facilitate learning in both males and females."

Enforcement (testing, accreditation, in-services) is a mistake. Those who disagree will undermine the process; those who agree are doing it already."

"A fear of being viewed as a radical feminist and the put-downs and labeling that go along with it. Even girls themselves are socialized to believe they have no voice."

General Comments:

"My emphasis is not just on equity. As a radical feminist, I disagree with the limited views for women sponsored by liberal feminists. I do believe that an examination of feminism is essential to enable women and men to break through the public backlash against advances for women."

"I've been thinking that courses which provide for strong relationship building are helpful to most girls. My women's journals talk so much about not trusting, not believing in themselves. It's scary!"

"I don't think much about (gender equity). Competent females model achievement and equity for their students. In the greater society, for K-12 students as well as college students, it is a problem of family values and church values."

"I feel that there are so many groups trying to gain equity. I hope that the different causes don't overwhelm people. As a teacher, one must be prepared to deal with gender as well as race, and maybe even religion. It's tough."

"As a teacher and field coordinator, I need to be mentor and counselor. Do I want to also be the feminist conscience from hell? Can I do both? How?"

References

Alton-Lee, A., Densem, P., & Nuthall, G. (1991). Imperatives of classroom research: Understanding what children learn about gender and race. In J. Morss & T. Linzey (Eds.), *Growing up: The politics of human learning* (pp. 93-117). Auckland, New Zealand: Longman Paul.

American Association of University Women. (1992). *The AAUW report: How schools shortchange girls*. Washington, DC: Author.

Baenninger, M., & Newcombe, N. (1989). The role of experience in spatial test performance: A meta-analysis. *Sex Roles, 20,* 327-344.

Baker, D. (1986). Sex differences in classroom interactions in secondary science. *Journal of Classroom Interaction, 22,* 212-218.

Banfield, B. (1988). Sex, race and disability: Triple threat to educational equity for girls and women. In M. Froschl & B. Sprung (Eds.), *Resources for educational equity: A guide for grades prekindergarten-12* (pp. xxiv-xxvii). New York: Garland.

Banks, J. A., & Banks, C. M. (1992). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Baptiste, H. P. (1990). Introduction: The challenge of preparing for equity. In H. P. Baptiste (Ed.), *Leadership, equity, and school effectiveness* (pp. 209-212). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Biklen, S., & Pollard, D. (Eds.) (1993). *Gender and education*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Brophy, J. (1985). Interactions of male and female students with male and female teachers. In L. Wilkinson & C. Marrett (Eds.), *Gender influences in classroom interaction* (pp. 115-142). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Campbell, J., Voekl, K., & Donahue, P. (1997, August). Report in brief: NAEP 1996 trends in academic progress. [WWW document]. URL *http://www.ed.gov/NCES/NAEP/96report/97986.shtml*.

Center research reveals how schools shortchange girls. (1992, Spring). *Research Report, 11*(2), Wellesley College Center for Research on Women.

Davis, G., & Thomas, M. (1989). *Effective schools and effective teachers*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Eccles, J. (1989). Bringing young women to math and science. In M. Crawford & M. Gentry (Eds.), *Gender and thought: Psychological perspectives* (pp. 36-58). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Edmonds, R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. *Educational Leadership, 37,* 15-18.

Fennema, E., & Peterson, P. (1986). Teacher-student interactions and sex-related differences in learning mathematics. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 2*(3), 19-42.

Gay, G. (1990). Teacher preparation for equity. In H. P. Baptiste (Ed.), *Leadership, equity, and school effectiveness* (pp. 224-243). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Ginsburg, M., & Clift, R. (1990). The hidden curriculum of preservice teacher education. In W. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: A project of the Association of Teacher Educators* (pp. 450-465), NY: Macmillan.

Good, T., & Brophy, J. (1987). *Looking in classrooms*. New York: Harper.

Grant, C., & Koskala, R. (1986). Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. *Journal of Educational Research, 79*, 197-204.

Grant, C., & Secada, W. G. (1990). Preparing teachers for diversity. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 403-422). New York: Macmillan.

Grayson, D., & Martin, M. (1990). *GESA: Gender/ethnic expectations and student achievement teacher handbook* (Rev. ed.). Des Moines, IA: Graymill.

Grayson, D. (1987). *Evaluating the impact of the GESA program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 283 881)

Grossman, H., & Grossman, S. (1994). *Gender issues in education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Hanson, K. (1992, July). *Teaching mathematics effectively and equitably to females* (The Center for Equity & Cultural Diversity Working Paper No. 1). Newton, MA: Education Development Center.

Henington, M. (1981). Effect of intensive multicultural non-sexist instruction on secondary student teachers. *Educational Research Quarterly, 6*(1),65-75.

Hilke, E., & Conway-Gerhardt, C. (1994). *Gender equity in education*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.

Horgan, D. (1995). *Achieving gender equity: Strategies for the classroom*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Howe, F. (1979). The first decade of women's studies. *Harvard Educational Review, 49*, 413-421.

Jones, M. (1989). Gender issues in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*(1), 33-38.

Jungwirth, H. (1991). Interaction and gender findings of a micro-ethnographical approach to classroom discourse. *Educational Studies in Mathematics, 22*, 263-284.

Lather, P. (1983). Feminism, teacher education and curricular change: Women's studies as counter-hegemonic work. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 44*, 3182A-3183A. (University Microfilms No. 8401606)

Lerner, G. (1981). *Teaching women's history*. Washington, DC: American Historical Association.

Maccoby, E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist, 45*, 513-520.

Mader, C. (1994). Gender equity instruction in Michigan teacher education programs. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 55*, 1917A (University Microfilms No. 9431288).

Mader, C., & King, C. (April, 1995). *Awareness of gender equity within teacher education programs*. Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), San Francisco, CA.

Mader, C., & Sanders, J. (July, 1994). *Equity issues in teacher education programs.* Annual Meeting of the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, Olympia, WA.

Maher, F., & Tetreault, M. (1994). *The feminist classroom.* NY: Harper Collins.

Martin, R., & Lock, R. (1991, Summer). Confronting realities: Cultural reproduction in physical education an analysis of nonsexist behaviors of student teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, pp. 45-55.

Masland, S. (1992, October). *Gender and ethnic awareness in teacher education.* Paper presented at "Taking the Lead: Balancing the Educational Equation," conference co-sponsored by California American Association of University Women and Mills College, Oakland CA.

McCune, S., & Matthews, M. (1975a). Eliminating sexism: Teacher education and change. *Journal of Teacher Education, 26*, 294-300.

McCune, S., & Matthews, M. (1975b). Women's studies and teacher education: Actuality and potential, *Journal of Teacher Education, 26*, 340-344.

McIntosh, P. (1984). Interactive phases of curricular re-vision. In B. Spanier, A. Bloom, & D. Boroviak (Eds.), *Toward a balanced curriculum* (pp. 25-35). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education. (1989). *A review of the at-risk literature with special emphasis on female students: A research summary.* Lansing, MI: Author.

Michigan State Board of Education, Office for Sex Equity in Education. (1992). *The influence of gender-role socialization on student perceptions.* Lansing, MI: Author.

Moody, J., & Gifford, V. (1990, November). *The effect of grouping by formal reasoning ability, formal reasoning ability levels, group size and gender on achievement in laboratory chemistry.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid South Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. 326 443).

National Science Foundation. (1990). *Women and minorities in science and engineering.* Washington, DC: National Science Foundation.

Nelson, C. (1990). Gender and the social studies: Training preservice secondary social studies teachers. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 51*, 730A-731A. (University Microfilms No. 9021339)

Page, S., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). Sex and expectations of teachers and sex and race of students as determinants of teaching behavior and student performance. *Journal of School Psychology, 28*, 119-131.

Pflaum, S., Pascarella, E., Boswick, M., & Auer, C. (1980). The influence of pupil behaviors and pupil status on teacher behaviors during oral reading lessons. *Journal of Educational Research, 74*, 99-105.

Pryor, S. (1997). Preservice teacher attitudes and knowledge of gender-equitable teaching methods. In Symposium Proceedings, *Gender and race on the campus and in the school: Beyond affirmative action* (pp. 275-287). Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women.

Pryor, S. (1996). Preservice teacher preparation and leadership for gender equity. *Dissertation Abstracts International, "55*, 1917A" (University Microfilms No.).

Purcell, P., & Stewart, L. (1990). Dick and Jane 1989. *Sex Roles, 22*, 177-185.

Putnam, S., & Self, P. (1988). *Social play in toddlers: Teacher intrusions*. Greensboro: University of North Carolina. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 319 529)

Riley, L., Baldus, L., Nelson, O., Schuler, B., & Keyes, M. (1993, February). *"My worst nightmare...": Wisconsin students' perceptions of being the other gender*. Menomonie, WI: University of Wisconsin-Stout, Center for Vocational, Technical and Adult Education.

Rose, T., & Dunne, F. (1989). Gender equity for a new generation: Teacher educators can make a difference. *Contemporary Education, 61*, 29-31.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1980). Sexism in teacher education texts. *Harvard Educational Review, 50*, 36-46.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1981). The development and field trial of a non-sexist teacher education curriculum. *High School Journal, 64*, 331-336.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1982). *Sex equity handbook for schools*. New York: Longman.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1986). Sexism in the classroom: From grade school to graduate school. *Phi Delta Kappan, 67*, 512-515.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1989). *The report card #1: The cost of sex bias in schools and society*. Washington, DC: Mid-Atlantic Equity Center.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1994). *Failing at fairness*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Klein, S. (1991). The issue of gender in elementary and secondary education. In C. Grand (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education, 17* (pp. 269-334). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Sanders, J. (May, 1997). Teacher education and gender equity. *ERIC Digest, 96*(3).

Shakeshaft, C. (1986). A gender at risk. *Phi Delta Kappan, 68*, 495-503.

Sleeter, C. (1993). Power and privilege in white middle-class feminist discussions of gender and education. In S.K. Biklen & D.Pollard (Eds.), *Gender and education*. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Smith, N., Greenlaw, M., & Scott, C. (1987). Making the literate environment equitable. *Reading Teacher, 40*, 400-407.

Stein, N. (1992, November 4). School harassment: An update. *Education Week*, p. 37.

Stein, N. (1993). It happens here too: Sexual harassment and child sexual abuse in elementary and secondary schools. In S. Biklen & D. Pollard (Eds.), *Gender and education* (pp. 191-203). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Stewart, L. (1992, March 27). Better training seen as solution: Colleges try improving qualifications. *Detroit Free Press*, pp. 1A, 13A.

Streitmatter, J. (1994). *Toward gender equity in the classroom: Everyday teachers' beliefs and practices*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Stromquist, N. (1989, July). *The state and gender equity in U.S. education.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Comparative and International Education Society, Cambridge, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 850).

Styer, S. (1982). *Women's studies courses in teacher education* Chicago: Northeastern Illinois University (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 262).

Tetreault, M. (1985). Phases of thinking about women in history: A report card on the textbook. *Women's Studies Quarterly, 13*(3/4), 35-47.

Titus, J. (1993). Gender messages in education foundations textbooks. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*, 38-43.

White, P. (1992, Janúary). *Women and minorities in science and engineering: An update.* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 359 034)

Whyte, J. (1984). Observing sex stereotypes and interactions in the school lab and workshop. *Educational Review, 36*(1), 75-86.

Wilkinson, L., Lindow, J., & Chiang, C. (1985). Sex differences and sex segregation in students' small-group communication. In L. Wilkinson & C. Marrett (Eds.), *Gender influences in classroom interaction* (pp. 185-207). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Wilson, C. (1993, August). *Gender equity components in preservice teacher education programs.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Coalition for Sex Equity in Education, Ann Arbor, MI.

Woolever, R. (1981, November). *Sex equity in teacher education.* Paper presented at the meeting of the National Council for the Social Studies, College and University Faculty Assembly, Detroit, MI. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 416).